



*ITW*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Here the Application of: ) Group Art Unit: 1796  
)  
David Graham, et al )  
) Examiner: Metzmaier  
Serial Number: 10/569,221 )  
)  
Filed: February 22, 2006 )  
)  
Title: CONTROLLING THE FORMATION ) Response to Interview  
OF CRYSTALLINE HYDRATES IN )  
FLUID SYSTEMS )  
)  
Attorney Docket: MSH - 269 ) September 1, 2010

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Interview Summary mailed August 3, 2010, the applicant hereby submits a rendition of the Interview.

The applicant believes that this response does not incur any additional fees, however, in the event that the Commissioner determines that such fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Charge Account 13-2492.

The inventor, Dr. David Graham, Robert McKellar, his attorney, and Examiner Daniel Metzmaier carried out a telephonic interview on August 2, 2010.

There were no exhibits shown.

The claims discussed included claims 13, 15, and 33.

The prior art discussed is the primary reference cited by the Examiner, namely, Shell Internationale Research Maatschappij BV, WO 01/7727 A1 (also characterized as the "Klomp" reference.

Agreement was not reached.

In summary, Dr. David Graham provided the Examiner with a description of the general nature of the prior art from his perspective, including a discussion of the nature of the instant invention and how it differed with regard to the manner in which the invention actually operated. The Examiner responded by declaring that the language to carry the essence of what Dr. Graham described was not present in the claims.

The prior art methodology of controlling hydrate formation, wherein the Klomp reference was characterized as a reduction of the crystalline hydrate temperature by the polymer interrupting the formation of crystal formation versus the instant invention which claims encouraging hydrate formation within the polymer. The examiner indicated the method step was "contacting" with the same or similar materials and it was reasonable to expect the claimed functional language.

Discussed possible showing the Klomp reference does not meet the claimed functional language. We also discussed the possible incorporation of claims 13 and 15 into the scope of claim 33 regarding the terms "associated", the "solid particle", "scavenging". Also discussed the possible limitation that would define the "product" of polymer having gas hydrated formed within the polymer structure.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. McKellar

Reg. No. 26,002

Telephone: (989) 631-4551

Facsimile: (989) 631-4584

784 South Poseyville Road

Midland, Michigan 48640